

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Attorney Docket No. **020431.0953**

In re Application of:

**MANOEL TENORIO**

Serial No. **10/032,945**

Filed: **27 SEPTEMBER 2001**

For: **DYNAMIC DATABASE REDIRECTION  
USING SEMANTIC TAXONOMY  
INFORMATION**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Examiner:

**MILA AIRAPETIAN**

Art Unit: **3625**

Confirmation No.: **7105**

**STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir/Madam:

A Corrected Interview Summary Form in the subject Application was mailed to the undersigned on 23 April 2007, which provides for a response period ending 23 May 2007. This Statement of the Substance of the Interview is being filed prior to the ending of the response period 23 May 2007.

**REMARKS:**

A Corrected Interview Summary Form in the subject Application was mailed to the undersigned, along with a Response to Rule 312 Communication, on 23 April 2007. The Response to Rule 312 Communication and the Corrected Interview Summary form was mailed in response to an Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.312, mailed 14 February 2007.

The Corrected Interview Summary Form indicates that the substance of the telephonic interview must be included in the formal written reply to the last Office Action. (See MPEP Section 713.04). The Corrected Interview Summary Form further indicates that if a reply to the last Office Action has already been filed, Applicant is given one month from this interview date, or the mailing date of this Corrected Interview Summary Form, whichever is later, to file a Statement of the Substance of the Interview.

In response, the Applicant is respectfully submitting this Statement of the Substance of the telephonic interview, conducted on 26 October 2006 between the undersigned, Mr. Laureanti and Examiner Airapetian.

**Telephonic Interview 26 October 2006**

Examiner Airapetian telephoned the undersigned, Mr. Laureanti, on 26 October 2006 to conduct a telephone interview on the subject Application. During the telephone interview on 26 October 2006, Examiner Airapetian proposed minor changes to independent Claims 1, 10, 21, and 32 to further clarify Applicant's claimed invention. Examiner Airapetian suggested using an Examiner's Amendment advance prosecution of the subject Application and place the subject Application in condition for Allowance.

The Applicant respectfully submits that although the Applicant believes independent Claims 1, 10, 21, and 32 are directed to patentable subject matter, and in condition for allowance without amendment. The Applicant agreed to allow the Examiner to amend independent Claims 1, 10, 21, and 32, in an effort to expedite prosecution of the subject Application and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. In addition, the Applicant agreed to allow the

Examiner to amend dependent Claims 6 and 9 in an effort to expedite prosecution of this Application and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention and amend dependent Claims 12 and 23 to correct certain antecedent basis issues.

By making these amendments, the Applicant makes no admission concerning the merits of the Examiner's rejections or objections of the previous Office Actions, and respectfully reserves the right to address any statement or averment of the Examiner not specifically addressed in this Statement of the Substance of the Interview. Particularly, the Applicant reserves the right to pursue broader claims in this Application or through a continuation patent application. No new matter has been added by the Examiner's amendment.

In addition, although the Examiner's Initial Interview Summary Form did not expressly state that the Examiner's Amendment included amendments to Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 12, 21, 23, and 32, there was twelve (12) pages attached to the Initial Interview Summary Form showing the Examiner's Amendments to Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 12, 21, 23, and 32.

#### **Telephonic Call to Examiner on 4 December 2006**

In light of the above-discussed deficiencies in the Examiner's Interview Summary Form, the undersigned, Mr. Laureanti, telephoned Examiner Airapetian on 4 December 2006 to discuss these deficiencies.

During the telephone conference on 4 December 2006, Examiner Airapetian suggested filing an Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.312 to ensure that the Examiner's Amendment to independent Claims 1, 10, 21, and 32 and dependent Claims 6, 9, 12, and 23 were corrected according to the telephonic interview, conducted on 26 October 2006 between the undersigned, Mr. Laureanti and Examiner Airapetian.

In response the Applicant filed an Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.312 on 14 February 2007, to correct the above-discussed deficiencies in the Examiner's Amendment.

## **Applicant's Claims are Patentable over the Prior Art of Record**

The Applicant respectfully reiterates here, that independent Claims 1, 10, 21, and 32 are considered patentably distinguishable over the proposed combination of *Jammes*, *Giovannoli*, and *Etten*. With respect to dependent Claims 2-9, 11-20, and 22-31: Claims 2-9 depend from independent Claim 1; Claims 11-20 depend from independent Claim 10; and Claims 22-31 depend from independent Claim 21. Thus, Claims 1-32 are not rendered obvious by the proposed combination of *Jammes*, *Giovannoli*, and *Etten* and are in condition for allowance.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for proposing the Examiner's Amendment and the Notice of Allowance mailed on 30 November 2006. The Applicant also thanks the Examiner for entering the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.312, in order to correct the above-discussed deficiencies in the Examiner's Amendment. The Applicant is submitting this Statement of the Substance of the Interview prior to the ending of the response period of 23 May 2007.

**CONCLUSION:**

Although the Applicant believes no fees are deemed to be necessary; the undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayments, to **Deposit Account No. 500777**.

**Please link this application to Customer No. 53184 so that its status may be checked via the PAIR System.**

Respectfully submitted,

8 May 2007  
Date

/Steven J. Laureanti/signed  
Steven J. Laureanti, Registration No. 50,274

BOOTH UDALL, PLC  
1155 W. Rio Salado Pkwy., Ste. 101  
Tempe AZ, 85281  
214.636.0799 (mobile)  
480.830.2700 (office)  
480.830.2717 (fax)  
steven@boothudall.com

**CUSTOMER NO. 53184**